



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,724

04/12/2005

Johannes J. Guns

4662-6

9141

23117 7590 12/12/2008
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

JACKSON, MONIQUE R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/529,724	Applicant(s) GUNS ET AL.	
	Examiner Monique R. Jackson	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/8/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 9/8/08 has been entered. New claims 23-25 have been added. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neumann (USPN 3,839,129) in view of Minnick et al. Neumann teaches a method of making an injection molded, decorative plastic article with a vacuum metallized surface comprising the basic sequential steps as instantly claimed wherein a metallized film is inserted into a mold cavity and the mold cavity is filled with molten plastic by means of injection molding, followed by cooling and removing of the molded article from the mold cavity (Entire document). Neumann teaches that the substrate layer of the metallized film is preferably a material which is identical with or compatible to the substance used to mold the article, with examples including acrylic resins, linear polyamides such as nylons, polyallomer materials, polyethylenes, polypropylenes, ABS resins, styreneacrylonitrile copolymers, polystyrene resins, impact polystyrenes containing synthetic or natural rubbers, polycarbonates, vinyl resins, methyl methacrylates, and various types of plastic papers, or any compatible mixture thereof, but do not specifically teach that the metallized film comprises at least one layer consisting essentially of a thermoplastic elastomer containing polyether segments as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize any polymeric or elastomeric material or select from suitable polymeric or elastomeric materials based upon the intended end use of the final molded article, wherein copolyesters including copolyether esters would have

Art Unit: 1794

been obvious given the teachings of polyesters in general, and to determine the optimum thickness or layers to provide the desired mechanical, physical and aesthetic properties for a particular end use, wherein the claimed thickness range is typical for decorative films. Further, Minnick shows that it is known to carry out a method of molding a composite article wherein the article includes a decorated film comprising at least one layer consisting essentially of a thermoplastic elastomer containing polyether segments (Column 8, lines 55-59). Minnick and Neumann are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, methods of molding decorative composites and hence, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Minnick's specific material for the film in Neumann in order to produce an article that is required to have the physical and chemical characteristics of a thermoplastic elastomer containing polyether segments, including those as instantly claimed such as Shore D hardness. Further, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide additional decorative features by known method steps such as by laser marking based upon the desired decorative properties for a particular end use.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loew (USPN 3,654,062) in view of Minnick. Loew teaches an injection molded article comprising a plastic material and a facing sheet which is a laminated structure comprising a vacuum metallized film on a polymer layer, wherein the article is formed by placing the facing sheet in the mold cavity and then injection molding the plastic material against facing sheet in the mold cavity, then cooling and removing the molded article as instantly claimed (Entire document). Though Loew teaches that the facing sheet is preferably polyethylene terephthalate having a thickness of 1/3 to

Art Unit: 1794

7 mils (Col. 1-2), Loew does not specifically limit the material of the facing sheet nor does Loew recite the use of an elastomer comprising polyether segments as instantly claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize any polymeric or elastomeric material or select from suitable polymeric or elastomeric materials based upon the intended end use of the final molded article, wherein copolyesters including copolyether esters would have been obvious given the teachings of polyesters in general, and to determine the optimum thickness or layers to provide the desired mechanical, physical and aesthetic properties for a particular end use, wherein the claimed thickness range is typical for decorative films. Further, Minnick shows that it is known to carry out a method of molding a composite article wherein the article includes a decorated film comprising at least one layer consisting essentially of a thermoplastic elastomer containing polyether segments, including elastomers derived as instantly claimed (Col. 8, lines 55-59; Col. 15, lines 51-57). Minnick and Loew are combinable because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, methods of molding decorative composites and hence, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Minnick's specific material for the film in Loew in order to produce an article that is required to have the physical and chemical characteristics of a thermoplastic elastomer containing polyether segments, including those as instantly claimed such as Shore D hardness. Further, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide additional decorative features by known method steps such as by laser marking based upon the desired decorative properties for a particular end use.

Art Unit: 1794

Double Patenting

4. Claims 1-25 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 7, and 9-23 of copending Application No. 10/473177 (US 2004/0115389) for the reasons recited in the prior office action.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique R. Jackson whose telephone number is 571-272-1508. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays, 10:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Monique R Jackson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794
December 8, 2008